



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,869	12/28/2000	Sunil H. Contractor	BELL-0048/00124	7435

7590 07/30/2003

Susan C. Murphy  
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ  
MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46TH Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2697	

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

AS

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/749,869	CONTRACTOR ET AL.	
	Examiner Md S Elahee	Art Unit 2697	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-37 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>08</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments mailed on 05/14/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the Applicant's remarks, it is agreed that Cox does not disclose that the at least 50 characters of identifying information associated with the first telephone station are audibly communicated to the second telephone station as required by Applicants' amended claim 1. However, Devillier does disclose the identifying information associated with the first telephone station is audibly communicated to the second telephone station. Thus a new ground of rejection of Devillier in view of Cox is applied below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 11, 13-16, 21-25, 28, 32-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435).

Regarding claim 11, Devillier teaches that at the service switching point, initiating a query to the service control point to identify the tandem to handle a call from the calling party to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines

25-42; ‘initiating a query’ reads on the claim ‘forwarding a request’, ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘one of the plurality of services nodes’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the service control point, identifying the tandem to handle a call from the calling party to the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘one of the plurality of services nodes’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the tandem identified by the service control point, initiating a query to the service control point to provide information associated with the calling party to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘initiating a query’ reads on the claim ‘forwarding a request’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the service control point, identifying information associated with the calling party from a database on the service control point (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the tandem identified by the service control point, receiving the information associated with the calling party from the service control point (fig.1,

fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the tandem, audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 50-61; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 13, Devillier teaches that information identifying the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 14, Devillier teaches that querying a database using information identifying the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 15, Devillier teaches a request from the subscriber to accept the call from the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 16, Devillier teaches a request from the subscriber to reject the call from the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘notifying’ reads on the claim ‘receiving’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 21, Devillier teaches that a service switching point, in communication with the calling party (fig.1, fig.4; col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that a tandem communicating with the service switching point and the tandem, audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 25-42, 50-61; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that a services control point communicating with the service switching point and the tandem and having a database including information associated with the calling party wherein the tandem receives the information associated with the calling party from the service control point and communicates an audible announcement of the line information to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 25-42, 50-61; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 22, Devillier teaches that the service control point, upon receipt of a request from the service switching point, queries a database and identifies a tandem adapted to connect the calling party and the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘calling party’ reads on

the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 24, Devillier teaches that the identified tandem initiates a query to the service control point requesting information concerning the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘initiates a query’ reads on the claim ‘sends a message’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 25, Devillier further teaches that the service control point queries the database and returns information concerning the calling party to the tandem (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 28, Devillier further teaches that the service control point queries the database and returns information concerning the calling party to the tandem (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 32, Devillier teaches teaches a request the subscriber to accept or reject the call from the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 33, Devillier teaches connecting the calling party and the subscriber if the subscriber accepts the call and the tandem connecting the caller with the called party

Art Unit: 2697

(abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 34, Devillier teaches ending the call if the subscriber rejects the call and the services node terminating the caller with the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘ending’ reads on the claim ‘terminating’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 35, Devillier further teaches sending the caller to the voice mail of the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘sending the caller’ reads on the claim ‘directs the call from the first telephone station’, ‘voice mail’ reads on the claim ‘voice mailbox’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 37, Devillier teaches that the tandem upon receipt of a request from the subscriber to accept the call from the calling party, connects the caller with the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,533).

Regarding claim 1, Devillier teaches receiving a telephone call from the calling party directed to the subscriber via the switching network (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.2, lines 42-44; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches determining line information associated with the calling party number from a database stored at a services control point (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 50-61; ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier fails to teach “the information comprising at least 50 characters of identifying information”. Cox teaches the information comprising at least 50 characters of identifying information (abstract; col.2, lines 49-67, col.17, lines 50-67, col.18, lines 1-67; ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘data’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow the information comprising at least 50 characters of identifying information as taught by Cox. The motivation for the modification is to have the higher data length in order to provide enough space for the user’s name.

Devillier further teaches audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 50-61; ‘announcing’ reads on the claim ‘communicating’, ‘line

information' reads on the claim 'information' and 'calling party' reads on the claim 'first telephone station' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Regarding claim 3, Devillier teaches providing an audible announcement to the subscriber requesting a desired response identifying whether to accept or reject the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; 'providing' reads on the claim 'transmitting', 'announcement' reads on the claim 'message', 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station' and 'desired response' reads on the claim 'response').

Regarding claim 4, Devillier teaches notifying from the subscriber a message identifying whether to accept or reject the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; 'notifying' reads on the claim 'receiving', 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station' and 'message' reads on the claim 'signal').

Regarding claim 5, Devillier teaches connecting the calling party and the subscriber if the subscriber accepts the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; 'calling party' reads on the claim 'first telephone station' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Devillier further teaches ending the call if the subscriber rejects the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; 'ending' reads on the claim 'terminating' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Regarding claim 6, Devillier teaches connecting the calling party with the voice mail of the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; 'calling party' reads on the claim 'first telephone station', 'voice mail' reads on the claim 'voice mailbox' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Regarding claim 8, Devillier teaches receiving information associated with the calling party and inherently with the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.2, lines 42-44; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 10, Devillier teaches retrieving a name associated with the owner of the caller line (abstract; fig.1; col.3, lines 50-65; ‘owner of the caller line’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 26, Devillier fails to teach “at least more than 50 characters of data”. Cox teaches retrieving at least 50 characters of information from the database (abstract; col.2, lines 49-67, col.17, lines 50-67, col.18, lines 1-67; ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘data’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a 50 characters of data as taught by Cox. The motivation for the modification is to have the higher data length in order to provide enough space for the user’s name.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,533) and further in view of Griffiths et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,481,602).

Regarding claim 7, Devillier in view of Cox fails to teach “continuing to send a ringing signal to the first telephone station until a ring timer expires”. Griffiths teaches playing ringing to the calling party until a timer expires (abstract; col.2, lines 1-20; ‘playing ringing’ reads on the claim ‘continuing to send a ringing signal’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone

station' and 'ring timer' reads on the claim 'timer'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Cox to allow a ring timer as taught by Griffiths. The motivation for the modification is to have the ring timer in order to provide the calling party more time having the chance to get connected with the called party.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,533) and further in view of Madoch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,409).

Regarding claim 9, Devillier in view of Cox fails to teach "at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the information associated with the first telephone station". Madoch teaches at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number (fig.4; col.4, lines 30-49; 'the originating number' reads on the claim 'the information associated with the first telephone station'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Cox to allow a query a second service control point as taught by Madoch. The motivation for the modification is to have the query a second service control point in order to provide the information associated with the calling party.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Malik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,875).

Regarding claim 12, Devillier further fails to teach "retrieving at least more than 15 characters of data from said database". Malik teaches retrieving at least more than 15 characters

of data from the database (col.3, lines 13-26, col.8, lines 57-67, col.9, lines 1-21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow more than 15 characters of data as taught by Malik. The motivation for the modification is to have more than 15 characters of data from the database in order to provide information about the calling party as well as the called party.

9. Claims 17 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Madoch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,409).

Regarding claim 17, Devillier teaches initiating a query to the database for the information associated with the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘initiates a query’ reads on the claim ‘sends a message’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier fails to teach “if no information is found in the database at the service control point, querying at least another service control point for the information associated with the first telephone station”. Madoch teaches if no information is found in the database at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number (fig.4; col.4, lines 30-49; ‘a second service control point’ reads on the claim ‘at least another service control point’ and ‘the originating number’ reads on the claim ‘the information associated with the first telephone station’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a query a second service control point as taught by Madoch. The motivation for the modification is to have the query a second service control point in order to provide the information associated with the calling party.

Devillier further teaches that at the service control point, sending the information associated with the calling party to the services node (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and tandem’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 27, Devillier fails to teach “said service control point queries at least a second service control point for information associated with the first telephone station”. Madoch teaches the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number (fig.4; col.4, lines 30-49; ‘the originating number’ reads on the claim ‘the information associated with the first telephone station’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a query a second service control point as taught by Madoch. The motivation for the modification is to have the query a second service control point in order to provide the information associated with the calling party.

10. Claims 18-20 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,809).

Regarding claim 18, Devillier fails to teach “converting textual information to audible signals”. Bossemeyer teaches converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-6; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible signals’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the

modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

Regarding claim 19, Devillier fails to teach “converting textual information to audible signals by means of computer-generated sounds”. Bossemeyer teaches converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format by means of pre-processor (abstract; fig.3, fig.4; col.3, lines 16-20, col.4, lines 17-28; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible signals’ and ‘pre-processor’ reads on the claim ‘computer-generated sounds’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

Regarding claims 20 and 31, Devillier teaches playing announcements (col.4, lines 36-39; ‘announcements’ reads on the claim ‘pre-recorded speech files’).

Regarding claim 29, Devillier fails to teach “the services node converts the information associated with the first telephone station to an audible message”. Bossemeyer teaches converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-6; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible signals’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

Regarding claim 30, Devillier fails to teach “the audible message is computer-generated”. Bossemeyer teaches the text-to-speech format by means of pre-processor (abstract; fig.3, fig.4; col.3, lines 16-20, col.4, lines 17-28; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible message’ and ‘pre-processor’ reads on the claim ‘computer-generated’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and further in view of Dugan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,411).

Regarding claim 23, Devillier teaches audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.3, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-67, col.4, lines 1-13, 50-61; ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further fails to teach “a signal is detected”. Dugan teaches that DTMF tones is detected in response to system prompts (col.70, lines 11-30; ‘DTMF tones’ reads on the claim ‘signal’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a signal detection as taught by Dugan. The motivation for the modification is to have the detection in order to provide a request for the information associated with the calling party.

12. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and further in view of Griffiths et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,481,602).

Regarding claim 36, Devillier fails to teach “continues to transmit a ringing signal to the first telephone station until a ring timer expires”. Griffiths teaches playing ringing to the calling party until a timer expires (abstract; col.2, lines 1-20; ‘playing ringing’ reads on the claim ‘continues to transmit a ringing signal’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘ring timer’ reads on the claim ‘timer’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to allow a ring timer as taught by Griffiths. The motivation for the modification is to have the ring timer in order to provide the calling party more time having the chance to get connected with the called party.

### *Conclusion*

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (703)305-4717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Art Unit: 2697

*M. E.*  
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
July 24, 2003

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

